DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 677 SP 024 050

AUTHOR Martin, Ralph E., Jr.; Wood, George H.
TITLE Early Field Experiences: Unification of Cooperating Teachers' and Teacher Education Students' Diverse Perspectives.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Choice; *Cooperating Teachers; Educational Research; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Attitudes; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study was made of the perceived success or failure of early field experiences prior to student teaching as perceived by cooperating teachers (CT) and field experience students (FES). Subjects were secondary school teacher education majors (n=145) and their cooperating teachers (n=34). Measures were taken of expectations, problems, and values over a period of nearly two years. Questions directed to the CTs concerned expectations they brought to the experience, problems they incurred in dealing with FESs, and help they received from the FESs. Field experience students were queried about expectations they brought to the experience and usefulness of the field experience as they decided about and prepared for a teaching career. A third question sought to determine ways in which the diverse perspectives of CTs and FESs hindered the development of a positive field experience. A comparison was made of responses to the questions, and major factors which emerged as significant were analyzed. Potential difficulties revealed by responses are discussed in this paper and methods suggested for bringing diverse outlooks closer together. Appended tables provide data on responses to specific problem statements and comparisons of attitudes toward the experience. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED242677

Early Field Experiences: Unification of Cooperating Teachers' and Teacher Education Students' Diverse Perspectives

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ralph E. Martin, Jr.
George H. Wood

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Ralph E. Martin, Jr.
Assistant Professor
School of Curriculum and Instruction
Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701

AND

George H. Wood
Assistant Professor
School of Curriculum and Instruction
Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New Orleans, LA, April, 1984

SP 024 050

Early Field Experiences: Unification of Cooperating Teachers' and Teacher Education Students' Diverse Perspectives

Introduction

In recent years teacher education programs throughout the country have put increased emphasis upon field experiences prior to student teaching for pre-service teachers (AACTE, 1976). Whether this programmatic redirection has come from state guidelines or internal attempts at program renewal, it seems clear that field experiences will remain a vital part of teacher preparation in the near future. However, up to this point the usefulness of such efforts is largely an article of faith, (i.e. Elam, 1971; Houston, 1974; Edelfelt, 1972; Devaney, 1976; Andrews, 1980). In fact, research on student teaching, which might be summoned in an effort to provide justification for field experiences, often yields results that indicate such experiences serve to negate university instruction (Matthews, 1967; Jacobs, 1968; Hoy, 1968; Roberts & Blankenship, 1970; Weinstock & Peccolo, 1970; Hoy & Rees, 1977; Zeicher, 1980).

Up to this point, research generated on early field experiences has been fairly sporadic and has taken a number of directions. Mentioned above was a series of studies which belong to the "advocacy" category of such research. These studies merely posit an assumed value of early field experiences and then focus on design and implementation. Another category of studies launched in this area are "ancillary" studies. Such work is concerned primarily with technical questions such as the legal aspects of field work (Morris & Curtis, 1983) and the logistics of placing students in the field (McNaughton, et. al., 1982). Both of these categories are flawed in their lack of a serious theoretical or empirical underpinning.

A third more fruitful category for research on early field placement is carried on under the "theoretical" lable. These studies attempt to link the theoretical considerations of field experience to the larger concerns of teacher preparation and teaching. This work is best exemplified by Zeichner's (1980, 1981, 1982, 1983) continued attempts to challenge the very assumptions underlying teacher preparation in general and field experiences in particular.

Finally, there is the "practical" category of inquiry into early field experiences. Best exemplified by studies that work to expose the assumptions underlying early field experiences in order to test their efficacy; such work has only recently begun to emerge. The diverse inquiry in this category includes Erdman's (1983) attempt to link theory to practice, Denton's (1982) exploration of field work as related to subsequent course work and Martin and Wood's (1984) examination of the effects of field experience students on the rural school setting. Clearly there is a need for expanding research and theory-building in both of the later two cateogries. Particularly, there seems to be a paucity of research in the "practical" arena which could work to inform future practice.

In responding to this need a formative examination of one such teacher education program was undertaken. Initially, the research program was designed to focus upon the effects of such experiences upon the teacher candidate. However, early in the investigators' work another fruitful avenue of inquiry arose - that of the effects such field placements were having upon the site of placement, the public schools. Thus, attempts were made to investigate the success or failure of early field experiences through the eyes of both teacher candidates and inservice teachers.

The program under consideration is the Ohio University secondary education curriculum. In this program, according to new (1980) State of Ohio guidelines,

teacher candidates are required to obtain 600 hours of clinical and field experiences. Of these hours, 300 are obtained in the student teaching experience itself with the remainder gained in early field experiences throughout the program. Courses such experiences are linked with include an introduction to teaching and teaching tasks, adolescent growth and development, the teaching of reading in the content area, and the advanced methods courses. Of interest to the researchers were the effects of field experiences located in the introductory and adolescent growth and development courses. The rationale for focusing on these courses relates to the fact that they appear first in the secondary education sequence. Thus, potential problems, promises, and diversity are the greatest as these education neophytes venture into schools for the first time as a "teacher" rather than a student.

It is important to recognize the rationale behind the early field experiences under investigation. These experiences are designed to introduce students into the actual practice of teaching in order to better facilitate their decision about becoming a teacher. The program thus serves three purposes: (1) offering faculty a close first look at teacher candidate; (2) offering teacher candidates a structured, hopefully reflective look at teaching in practice; and (3) linking theory to practice in the programs. The goal is to provide an educational experience in the best sense of experience developed by Dewey (1938),reflective praxis. This inquiry is thus guided by Erdman's (1983) insistence that

> (An) illuminative focus for assessing quality (in early field experiences) lies in the relationship between the expressed purposes articulated by teacher educators and what field experiences actually mean to preservice teacher. (27).

Three major questions were to provide the focus for examining the perceptions of teachers and teacher candidates relevant to field experiences. First, from the perspective of the cooperating teacher (CT) what expectations were brought to the experiences, what problems did they incur dealing with the field experience students

(FES), and how much help did these same individuals feel they received from the field experience students? Secondly, what expectations did the FES bring to the field experience and how useful did the FES find the experience as they attempted to decide about and prepare for a career in teaching? Third, in what ways did the diverse perspectives of the CTs and the FESs hinder the development of a positive field experience?

To begin to answer these questions, evaluation and survey instruments were administered to CTs involved in the initial field experience and a representative sample of FES in the program. Responses were compiled and follow-up interviews used to collaborate suspected findings.

The results of this study follow and while limited to one program, do present some interesting and instructive insights into field experiences for teacher candidates. By examining these diverse perspectives of the teacher in the field and the hopeful teacher in the university the potentialities as well as the problems of field experiences begin to emerge.

Methodology

Subjects for the study consisted of secondary teacher-education students (sophomores or juniors, n=145) enrolled in the first education course and their respective secondary classroom cooperating teachers (n=34). Data were collected during four academic quarters, over nearly two years. Measures taken included: cooperating teacher expectations of early field experience students, field experience student expectations of the early field experience, CT and FES perceptions of problems and values of field experiences.

CT expectations were measured before the experience, whereas problems and values were measured at the conclusion of the experience. FES expectations and

perceptions of problems and values of the field experience were measured by pre- and posttesting.

Instrumentation concerning expectations, problems, and value of field experiences originated from State of Ohio Department of Education status survey instruments developed and reported by Applegate and Lasley (1983a, 1983b, 1982, 1981). The research design for these instruments was modeled after earlier methods reported by Cruickshank, Kennedy, and Myers (1974), Cruickshank (1975), and Applegate (1978) and consisted of two phases: (1) the collection of incidents from a small, representative sample of respondents for the purpose of developing the status survey, and (2) collecting measures from a larger representative state-wide sample for the purpose of ranking expectations, problems and the like. After descriptive statistical analyses were completed, data were subjected to factor analysis to identify underlying constructs which could be inferred from teacher and field experience student perceptions.

In addition to direct statistical comparisons between local and state-wide responses to instrument items, common statistical tests of significance were used to examine variation between CT and FES responses on the basis of the factors and inferred constructs reported by Applegate and Lasley. These techniques are cited, where appropriate, in the sections which follow.

Cooperating Teachers

1. What expectations did cooperating teachers have for the early field experiences?

It is suspected that problems during field experiences may result because of the idealistic expectations cooperating teachers hold for university field experience students. A prior study (Applegate and Lasley, 1983a) undertaken to determine what CTs expect from FESs suggests that teacher educators may have to build a more realistic awareness among CTs regarding purposes and objectives to

be fulfilled by the FES. State-wide, CTs had unrealistic expectations which they held for FES. They expected FESs to have rather specialized skills and abilities far beyond planned levels of preparation and experience. CTs also failed, overall, to view field experiences as opportunities for FESs to engage in the practice of skill development and/or systematic observation.

Part of our research undertook a comparison of local CTs with those of the state-wide sample to see whether our teacher expectations differed and were excessive. CTs indicated their levels of agreement or disagreement (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) to 46 Likert-type variables on the instrument developed for the study above.

The grand mean for the state-wide sample was 4.500, whereas the OU sample sample grand mean was 4.100 and appeared to be substantially lower, perhaps more realistic. Twelve variables appeared to indicate significant expectations as reported by the state-wide sample (binomial test of the null hypothesis, upper tail, for each survey variable). Table 1 shows the ranks and means of the state-wide and OU CT samples. Ranks between samples differed considerably and 7 of 12 OU means were found to be significantly less than the state sample grand mean at the 0.05 level of significance.

Factor analysis of the state sample revealed 4 factors (Applegate and Lasley, 1983a). From these factors it was inferred that state of Ohio cooperating teachers largely held expectations regarding the FES': (1) teaching behaviors and attitudes, (2) initiative and enthusiasm, (3) adaptability and support, and (4) professionalism. When OU CT responses were ranked independent of state sample rankings, highest levels of expectations were held for survey variables which were associated with two factors: (2) initiative and enthusiasm, and (4) professionalism. Local cooperating teachers seemed to have lower ex-

pectation overall for the constructs represented by the factors. Indeed, for a first field experience it seems the OU CTs displayed more of a sense of realism by maintaining lower levels of expectations overall and choosing to prioritize expectations differently by expecting higher levels of FES initiative, enthusiasm (factor 2), and professionalism (factor 4) than teaching skills, classroom with-it-ness (factor 1), and the ability to think on one's feet (factor 3). It seems reasonable to expect the FES behaviors described by factors 1 and 3 to develop during more advanced field experiences, not first entries into the classroom. FES abilities to function at levels expected by CTs can contribute to a harmonious working relationship. FESs who function at other levels may contribute to difficulties and field experience problems.

2. What problems did cooperating teachers perceive?

Lasley and Applegate (1981) conducted a field experience problems survey for the State of Ohio Department of Education. The results of this survey are viewed as being an indication of how the state's population of cooperating teachers would respond to this question.

A sample of 34 local cooperating teachers was compared to the 172 teachers cited in the research. Each sample of teachers was asked to indicate agreement or disagreement to the problem statements reported by Lasley and Applegate. Rankings and differences between means were compared and are reported in Table 2.

The State of Ohio survey revealed cooperating teachers believed the most pressing problems were concerned with knowing university expectations, FES attendance and tardiness, and lack of FES teaching skills. The Ohio University sample indicated the most pressing problem as being the CT's lack

of time to spend with the FES. Lack of audio-visual and teaching skills and low FES interest in getting to know other classroom teachers also were highly ranked.

In addition to rankings, tests of significance were undertaken to compare the magnitude of the problem statement means reported for each sample. Sample sizes varied considerably (n=172 ,34) and homogeneity of variance was not assumed. Estimations of the standard error of difference and adjustments to the degrees of freedom to test hypotheses of equal problem statement means were based on procedures developed by Cochran and Cox as reported in Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979). Test statistics are reported in Table 2.

Significant differences between the sample means were found for 10 of 13 problem statements. The Ohio University sample means were substantially less than their state counterparts on problems dealing with university goals and objectives, FES attendance, general teaching skills, classroom readiness, preparation, supervision, professional behavior, and university assistance. Substantial differences were not noted with problem statements dealing with the operation of audio-visual equipment, CT time for the FES, and interest in other teachers.

Further tests of significance were undertaken to determine if the ratings reported for the problems were truly indicative of problems existing as described. In accordance with procedures reported by Lasely and Applegate (1981), cooperating teachers were asked to respond to each problem statement by indicating their levels of agreement or disagreement. Each statement was rated on a five choice Likert scale with "Strongly Agree" being a numerically high rating (5) and "Strongly Disagree" a low (1) rating. "Undecided" responses were rated as 3.

Mean ratings for all problem statements were less than 3.000 for the cooperating teachers represented by the Ohio University sample. It was

hypothesized that if the significance of these means was found to be significantly less than 3.000 ("Undecided") then it would appear tenable to interpret these findings as an indication that these problems did not exist as suggested by rankings based on the instrumentation. Agreement that the problems existed would result in means being found significantly greater than 3.000. Students t-tests were computed to determine the efficacy of our hypotheses. Means and test statistics are listed in Table 3. All problem statement means were significantly less than the null hypothesis, except statement 7. The cooperating teachers were "undecided" about the adequacy of the amount of time available to spend with their field experience students.

3. What value did cooperating teachers find in the field experience?

Justifiably, a great deal of attention is given to problems FESs may cause in the classroom. While some teachers see assisting with teacher instruction as part of their professional duties, many others have a genuine concern over minimizing outside disruptions in their classroom. This preoccupation has, however, led many investigators to overlook ways in which FESs may be beneficial to the classroom teacher. With diminishing resources for many school districts it is indeed appropriate, if not vital, to examine the potential positive and negative aspects of FES intervention in the classroom.

Given these concerns CTS were requested to respond to a series of questions on the assistance they received from their FES. In addition, a representative sample of the participating teachers was interviewed. Reports were gathered on 148 FESs placed in two school districts. In the reports teachers were asked to respond to a Likert scale rating instrument (choices being Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree) to the following items which had emerged during previous teacher field experience inservices: (1) my FES provided assistance with

paperwork; (2) my FES was able to help tutor students; (3) my FES helped motivate students; (4) my FES made small groups possible; (5) my FES made individualization possible; (7) having a FES allowed me more time for individual pupil needs; (7) my FES was more bother than he/she was worth; (8) my FES had a positive influence on the classroom; and (9) my FES had a positive influence on my teaching.

In order to interpret the survey results the questions were divided into four different, yet related, areas. The first of these was classroom mechanics, taken from the response to question number one. In this case we found that over 90 of the teachers either Agreed to Strongly Agreed that the university field experience students were able to provide assistance with their paperwork (grading, attendance, etc.) demands. (Refer to Table 4 for complete statistical analysis). Comments made by teachers when asked about this assistance mentioned materials FESs made, time put in grading assignments, and time the CT saved for instructional tasks by being relieved of various management duties.

The second area the questions addressed was classroom methodology. In particular, was the teacher better able to use a variety of approaches and more able to meet the needs of particular students when the FES was available? Through having available another trained adult in the classroom was a greater variety of methods used, especially those which stressed individualization and small groups? Teachers overwhelmingly Agreed or Strongly Agreed that with the additional help they were able to use small groups more often (83%), use more individualization (78%), have more students tutored (89%), and spend more time with students with special needs (79%). Several teacher comments are useful in understanding how helpful the university students were:

> "(Student A) was enthusiastic and very helpful when he tutored a 5th grade boy in math. His explanations were clear and he was sensitive to the child--gave lots of praise."

"I really enjoyed working with (Student D). She was willing and volunteered to do extra things such as making instructional games at home. She was eager to get into teaching and asked for opportunities to take over the instruction of a group. She was also eager to learn from her experience and incorporated principles learned from one teaching experience into the next one."

"I felt very good about my teaching performance--(Student E's) presence motivated me as a teacher."

"(Student F) is seriously dedicated to becoming a good teacher and her attitude and questions kept me on my toes to be a good model."

While teacher reports demonstrate that FESs had an overwhelmingly positive effect on the school setting, three potential problem areas had to be continually monitored by both university and public school faculty in order to insure such results. The first of these was the occasional FES who felt he/she was merely in the school to observe and not to participate. In these cases both the FES and the teacher were frustrated as neither gained what they wanted from the experience. Another source of frustration, for university faculty in particular, was the difficulty of placing FESs because some teachers felt they had little to gain and nothing to offer the FESs. Given that these teachers were paid a very minimal amount for their participation, at times it was difficult to gain access to some classrooms. Finally, the public school teachers expressed concern (developed during previous interactions with university placements) that the involvement of the university faculty with the field setting would be limited (in terms of observations, visits, and the like).

These difficulties were seemingly overcome through a close partnership between the faculties of the university and the schools. Frequent in-service meetings were held with groups of teachers and individual teachers to inform them of the FESs capabilities and to check on progress. School administrators

were enlisted to help explain to teachers the potential benefits of the field experience students. Additionally, university faculty made weekly visits to all field sites to monitor progress continually, suggest new ways to utilize the FES and to discuss both problems and successes with the school faculty. These strategies seemed to have paid off in that when the teachers were asked if the field experience students were more bother than they were worth (Item 7) not a single teacher responded in the affirmative and more than 95% of them either Strongly Disagreed or Disagreed with that conclusion.

Early Field Experience Students

4. What expectations did the FESs bring to the field experience?

Types of cooperating teacher problems with field experiences were cited earlier and clustered into six types: Problems (1) with the FES' orientation to teaching; (2) in understanding the partnership of teaching; (3) with FES professionalism; (4) with the FES' attitudes and values; (5) with enthusiasm for teaching; and (6) with the FES' planning and organizational skills. Researchers suggest that if knowledge about what field experience students expect were available, then ". . . teacher educators could structure field experiences that build on those expectations and possibly reduce the number of problems preservice teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors confront once field activities are initiated" (Applegate and Lasley, 1983b, p. 3).

Status survey instrumentation was designed according to the two phase procedures outlined earlier. FESs were asked to respond to 57 Likert-type expectancy variables by marking their level of agreement (5) or disagreement (1). Ohio University FES responses are compared with the state-wide sample in Table 5. Pretests measured OU FES expectancies before the experience, while posttests asked FESs to indicate the level to which they believed the expectancy was accom-

plished during the experience. Overall, the means for all posttest expectancies were lower, with significantly lower differences found for six of eight top ranked expectations. These differences suggest that OU FESs were not able to gain experiences compatible with their levels of expectancies.

Six underlying factors emerged from the state-wide analysis. These factors were named and described in terms of FES expectation for early field experiences. Names and brief descriptions follow (Applegate and Lasley, 1983b, p. 7-8):

Factor 1: Expectations for Assessing the Complexities of Teaching
Prospective teachers expect to develop a better understanding of their own abilities to perform in the teaching role and to make some assessment, based on observations of "real" teachers, of their own pedagogical strengths and weaknesses.

Factor 2: Expectations for Modeling Professional Practice
Prospective teachers expect to discover the subtleties of successful teaching and to develop an in-depth understanding of what it takes to be effective in the classroom.

Factor 3: Expectations for Acquiring Practical Insights and Ideas
Prospective teachers expect that early field experiences will provide them with an opportunity to acquire some practical and specific ideas for successful performance.

Factor 4: Expectations for Practicing Teaching Skills
Prospective teachers expect that early field experiences will provide an opportunity to practice teaching skills, such as lecturing, and to test their decision-making abilities.

Factor 5: Expectations for Understanding Various School and Classroom Settings
Prospective teachers expect that field experiences will enable them to understand how different teachers function in the same school setting and to see how different teachers react to classroom problems in diverse cultural contents.

Factor 6: Expectations for Dealing Directly with Students
Prospective teachers expect that early field experiences will serve as an opportunity to deal directly with students and to work with students who have special learning needs.

Most of the differences in ranks between the state-wide and OU FES samples occurred with items from factor 2. Variables which clustered to form this factor dealt with expectations relevant to observations and experiences encountered by students who anticipated student teaching soon thereafter. The OU FESs had lower expectancies for these variables. Table 6 lists the pre- to-post experience expectancy changes. Factors 5, 6 and 1 show decreases in expectancy for a majority of the variables included in these factors. These changes seem to warrant the conclusion that FESs believe they were not successful in: (1) experiencing varied school and classroom settings, (2) being able to deal directly with students having special needs, and (3) assessing accurately their own abilities relative to the complexities of teaching. It appears most FESs wanted to plunge right into the teaching act and may have believed themselves more capable of teaching than they were actually prepared to do.

Overall, it seems that FES levels of expectancies may have been more idealistic than realistic. Even though FES tend to view field experiences as opportunities for "real" learning about teaching, it seems many of them fully expect to leave field experiences equipped to deal with the numerous challenges and problems of teaching. Despite idealism vs. realism, if these expectations can be met, it seems likely the FES will experience satisfaction; if not met, frustration and disenchantment may occur. FES satisfaction and dissatisfaction may impact upon perceptions of problems and the values of field experiences.

5. How did field experience students perceive potential problems?

We were interested in how our secondary education field experience students perceived the same "problems" as discussed for CTs earlier. FES (n=145) were

asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement, like the CTs. The FES were sophomore and junior students and ratings were obtained at the end of their first education course and field experience. Rankings and means are compared with those of the CTs and are listed in Table 7. Students t-tests of significance with separate variance estimates were computed by a standard SPSS program (Table 7).

The FES reported lack of university assistance, inability to operate audio-visual equipment, and the university's lack of knowledge of what they (FES) had done or ought to do as the highest ranked "problems." Statistical comparisons of the means revealed three significant differences between the CT and FES means. In two cases the CT sample means were greater than the FES means: not enough time for the CT to sit down with the FES; and the FES could not operate audio-visual equipment. FES believed the college supervisor was less visible than perceived by the CTs. All told, the FES means were substantially less than "undecided" (3.000), thus indicating no real perceptions of field experience problems.

Despite an apparent lack of problems overall, some may assume the sending of "raw" recruits to observe and assist veteran teachers may place extra burdens on inservice teachers with the FES and universities benefitting at the expense of teachers. CTs have attested to the benefits of these experiences and we assume they are beneficial for FES. But how much value do FES find in early field experiences?

6. How valuable did the FES find field experiences as they made career decisions?

Given the acknowledged usefulness of FES in teacher classrooms, it seemed worthwhile to determine if the FES reciprocated with perceptions of value to their preparation as teachers. Lasley and Applegate (1981) identified six factors

which serve to describe areas of concern cooperating teachers express for field experience students. The cooperating teachers believe these areas represent key components of the field experience and FES professional preparation. Factor descriptions were used as a basis for developing 23 statements to which 145 secondary school FES were asked to respond by (1) rating the value of the statements' concepts to their teacher preparation and (2) reporting a self-assessment of their attainment of the criteria specified by the statements. Perceptions of value were selected from a 5 item Likert scale which ranged from 1 (not important) to 5 (very important). Self-assessments were similarly reported on a scale which ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Each variable statement was clustered around one of six factors which are named and described as follows:

Factor 1. Preparation for field experience. Each FES was asked to self-assess and indicate the value of their preparation for field assignments, knowledge of pupil learning patterns and behaviors, skills in lesson preparation, and curiousity about the process of becoming a teacher.

Factor 2. Understanding the partnership of teaching asked each FES to self-assess and rate the value of the importance of partnership arrangements in educating teachers, e.g., colleges, FES, teacher, and school personnel involvement.

Factor 3. Professionalism asked the FES to rate the professional responsibilities and cognizance of school norms, including being flexible and prepared to help the classroom teacher with activities.

Factor 4. FES attitudes and skills caused the FES to focus on the importance of positive relations with pupils, eagerness to assume classroom responsibilities, and skills in completing assigned tasks.

Factor 5. Enthusiasm for teaching asked the FES to rate their initiative, enjoyment, and enthusiasm when working with teachers and pupils.

Factor 6. Lesson planning and organization asked each FES to indicate his/her ability to teach, plan for instruction, organize materials, ask appropriate questions, and carry out classroom activities.

Grand means for all factor variables were examined to compare the FESs' perceptions of value and self-assessments which resulted from their field experience training. Value of the training, as measured by the FES "value" responses (means) to survey statements, was undeniably high (Table 8). The FES placed a higher value on affective components of the field experience (factors 3,4,5,2) and less value on the subject-centered and preparatory aspects of the experience (factors 2 and 6). The same held true for the cooperating teachers.

As shown by the self-assessment means reported in Table 9, the FESs indicated a rather high level of perceived attainment of the attitudes, skills, professionalism and understanding as desired by cooperating teachers. For each factor the self-assessment means were lower than the value placed upon them. In general, lower self-assessment factor means were interpreted as being indicative of FES realization that this was their first training experience and additional training and experiences were needed.

The "value" means reported for each factor may be viewed as an expression of the level of attainment desired by the FES. Analysis of variance was used to test for the differences between FES self-assessment and desired attainment (value) of the factors. Only self-assessment factors 1, 4, and 6 were found to be significantly less (Table 9) than their factor value counterparts. Factor 6, lesson planning and organization, was not stressed highly during the campus instruction since the intent was for the FES primarily to observe and assist

experienced teachers. Emphasis was given to this factor during another course taken during a later quarter, still the FES seemed to indicate more planning and classroom organization skill development would have improved their field experiences. Factor 4, professionalism, seems to reveal that student recognize their levels of professionalism need further development. Factor 1, preparation for the field experience, seems to indicate that more advance preparation should be provided before the experience to enable better FES participation in the field setting. Some FESs remarked about not understanding the pupils well enough to assist their teachers meaningfully, while others acknowledged that they thought they understood the role of a teacher, but soon realized how naively limited their viewpoints were. It was encouraging, however, to find that the FES, as a whole, improved significantly on their self-recognition of the importance of the partnership role of the CTs in preparing future teachers.

Overall the FES indicated that the field experience and correlated campus instruction provided a realistic opportunity for them to learn about the profession of teaching as it exists in a school setting. Particularly noteworthy were the comments which attested to the FESs personal discoveries about themselves and their preconceptions and stereotypes. Further evidence of self-discovered weaknesses and misconceptions about the role of teachers and the impact these experiences in schools has on the training of the prospective teachers can not be better stated than in the words of the FESs who offered these comments:

> "Prior to my experience this quarter, I felt teaching was an 8:00 to 3:00 job with summers off and teaching students from a pre-set plan. I never thought that it took so much planning and involvement. What a false stereotype I was under!"

> "... I have come to realize that it takes a great amount of skill to be a good teacher, especially the skills of communication. A teacher must be able to communicate and get along with his/her students in order to be effective ... (and) having patience and a high tolerance is very important."

"I need more experience in order to grow and the chance to change the things I did not like about my teaching style. My (cooperating) teacher helped me to look realistically at what I was doing."

"... I am more motivated now (about becoming a teacher) than before taking the course. I realize that the possibilities for innovation and diversity in teaching are limitless. Facing the challenge of stimulating interest in my subject is challenging. My message to the students is that there is life beyond the 'Dukes of Hazard.'"

Conclusions: Diversity and Value

This investigation suggests a number of general conclusions. The first is that cooperating teacher expectations for field experience student behaviors appeared more realistic than the rather idealistic expections the FESs held for themselves. We attribute these differences to the continued use of select CTs who, over the many quarters, have developed a realistic understanding of what abilities typical first course teacher education students have, as well as the expectations and requirements the preparatory program holds for the students. It seems most FESs are very enthusiastic about working with school pupils and "walking in the shoes" of a teacher. Their enthusiasm may inflate expectations to idealistic levels, beyond present and planned ability levels. Failure to function at expected levels may contribute to disappointments, frustrations, and self-doubts, all of which may manifest themselves in field related difficulties and/or contribute to potentially severe field experience problems.

The second conclusion concerns perceptions of problems of the types just mentioned. Overwhelmingly local CTs and FESs reported perceptions of fewer and less serious problems than other samples in the previously mentioned statewide studies. Even so, the FES rated the occurrance and importance of most problems less than did the CTs. Although statistically no problems were found, we believe the diverse perceptions on field problems and their importance to the CT-FES union suggests likely potential difficulties, provided there are inadequate

efforts by college supervisors to keep the field machinery well oiled. An obvious method of doing this is through CT-FES role definitions and expanded professional responsibility, reliability, attitude and impact awareness building for the FES.

Our final conclusion refers to the value of early experiences. We believe our data support the conclusion that both CTs and FESs regard early field experiences as valuable, but for different reasons. For field experience students there is no substitution for "real" classroom teaching experiences to help them make an important career decision and identify personal and emergent professional strengths as well as characteristics and skills which need improvement. Classroom teachers acknowledge these same benefits for the FES, but are more likely to "cooperate" by providing a classroom laboratory for the FES if there are benefits for the teacher. Many colleges offer small honoraria for teachers, but it is the time saved for the teacher while performing assigned responsibilities that seems to be the most highly regarded value. Resourceful teachers recognize that field experience students can help save them time and contribute meaningfully to classroom education if used wisely.

Conclusions reported in this "practice-oriented" study, particularly the latter, seem to validate the assumed value of early field experiences often offered by the "advocacy" group of studies cited in the introduction of this paper. We feel it necessary to expand upon this confirmation of value as a means of examining more closely and providing linkage between theory and field experience practice.

Beyond the personal benefits of early field experiences already reported for CTs and FESs, what broader, preparatory values exist? Do, in fact, early field experiences provide for reflective educational experiences as advocated by Dewey (1938) and Erdman (1983)?

As for the teacher candidates (FES), it seems clear that the early field experiences encourage a reflective look at teaching. This conclusion is drawn from the FESs' own reports about the perceived values of field experiences. In particular, we view it as advantageous that students' value means for the experience were higher than their own self-assessment means (Table 9). We interpret this to suggest that the students did indeed understand much of what is involved in teaching and that they have a long way to go before mastering those tasks.

This finding is perhaps related to the diversity of perspectives mentioned above. Indeed, it seems logical to assume that practicing teachers would hold differing views on the teaching act and teacher preparation than would inexperienced teacher candidates. However, it may have been precisely this variance that caused the continued negotiation of the CT/FES relationship and led to the teacher candidate's reflection on the actual practice of teaching. This is not to say, by any means, that this negotiation always led to reflective practice on the part of the FES. Given the unequal power relations between CT and FES it seems likely that the FES would often merely react to the CT's directive in order to "please" the CT. (In fact, this does seem to happen when FESs teach lessons for the CTs.) Yet even this experience seems to provide the material for campus discussion exploring the hows and whys of daily classroom instruction.

As for the classroom teachers, one theme emerged time and time again -- time itself. As many studies have shown (Goodlad, 1984; Boyer, 1983) one of the main factors which teachers claim limit their effectiveness is the time it takes tc deal with all students' needs as well as the bureaucratic demands of the job. During our surveys and interviews of CTs they frequently mentioned the help they received from FESs in resolving the time demands of the classroom. Most certainly,

this could become problematic if the FES was seen as nothing more than an errand runner. However, as the FES is brought progressively more into the instructional process virtually all CTs reported more available instructional time and the ability to use a greater variety of instructional methods. Further, CTs often mentioned that the availability of another "teacher" in the room with which to discuss their practice was most beneficial. As one CT put it:

> Very seldom do I get to talk through my classroom practices and maybe even have my assumptions challenged ... With (Student G) I found myself talking about teaching like I haven't done since undergraduate school.

It seems legitimate to claim, on the basis of the foregoing data and analysis, that these early field experiences do provide, for both CTs and FESs, the grounds for Dewey's (1938) reflective inquiry. That is, they draw problematic situations (diverse perspectives, teaching tasks, etc.) from actual experience (the public school classroom) to which a process of reflection can be applied to facilitate practice (see also Dewey, 1933). Most interestingly, this can happen for both the preservice and inservice teacher. While we would hesitate to generalize to all such early field experiences, what implications for practice can be drawn from this investigation?

Implications

Efforts to identify any diversity in perceptions held by persons involved with field experiences are helpful in uncovering potential difficulties as well as suggesting methods to bring diverse outlooks closer to a point of unification. We believe the responsibility for unification should start with college instructors and field supervisors. Their challenge is to orient CTs and FESs toward realistic levels of expectations, realistic perspectives of problems, and potential benefits for both parties which may exist beyond what is super-

ficially apparent. This is not to say that teachers and teacher education students are without accountability. Indeed these two types of persons are placed in a situation where close cooperation, assistance, mutual planning, and foresight are needed if each is to benefit wholesomely. In those instances where teachers and teacher education students are ill prepared for their field experience responsibilities, the supervisor can be the keystone to helping build a bridge for professional fulfillment.

More specific to the study reported here, the tasks of the supervisor included the following if unification was to be more closely realized:

(1) help resolve CT/FES conflicts in ways that did not tie the hands of the FESs and turn them over to the CTs only to have them function as paper graders, observers, and errand runners;

(2) work with CTs in order to help them develop the capability for critical dialogue with FESs; and

(3) help to structure specific times so CTs and FESs could carry out professional reflective dialogue.

Beyond the conclusions and implications reported for this study, it seems clear that more research is needed as to the ways various other participants see and benefit from the placement of preservice teachers in the field. Almost overlooked to this point is the effect university students have on the public school pupils with which they interact (Wood, et.al., 1983). Such research should address variables dealing with student maturation, the placement patterns in schools (see Johnson, et.al., 1982 for such a study), student preparation, and length of experience. Given the current fiscal health of many teacher preparation institutions the temptation may be great to cut back on support for a 'frill' like field work. The broader the data base in support of such

programs the less likely is their fiscal demise;

Several additional more generalizable implications include:

1) Teacher preparation programs should work to include or expand the field component of their program prior to student teaching. From the perspectives reported this element of teacher preparation is both beneficial and educative.

2) In obtaining field placements for students, university faculty and staff should demonstrate a clear awareness of potential problem areas. In so doing they can frequently prevent problems before they occur.

3) Enticements for teachers to take students into their classrooms should encompass more than the monetary. While such rewards are often limited the justified expectation of useful classroom assistance should be raised in order to help secure field placements. Perhaps an informal barter system, a tool often used during periods of economic uncertainty, could be reinstated. In exchange for placements, schools could be offered services (video-taping, loans for science equipment, etc.) or faculty time (for in-services, consulting, workshops and the like).

4) University faculty should be assigned, as part of their load, time for direct field observation. If the communication with all parties necessary for successful field work is to occur it must be initiated by university faculty on the school site.

5) Field experience students should be encouraged to initiate dialogue and volunteer for experiential activities rather than wait for the classroom teacher to make the suggestions, e.g., prepare materials, tutor students, acquire self-instruction in audio-visual use, visit a variety of classrooms, etc.

6) Supervisors and/or instructors should arrange field orientation for the teacher education students. This can be addressed on campus by discussing the students' roles, professional behaviors, course expectations, school regulations and teacher expectations. In the school setting the principal should be encouraged to meet with the students, conduct a tour of the school, and discuss school regulations, policies, field experience operating procedures, etc.; the teacher can discuss classroom policies, rules, expectations, etc.

7) Given the increasingly limited budgets many small school systems face they may prove to offer ideal settings for field experiences. While these locations are often overlooked, half of the data collected in this study was from small rural school districts. These data indicated student and teacher satisfaction maintained its high level in both settings.

While a number of these implications and conclusions may seem common sense to many teacher educators we believe they are worth restating with a data base behind them. As many institutions either introduce or expand their field experience components there is always the possibility that the "obvious" may be overlooked. This initial foray only begins the research needed to expand the evidence supportive of field experiences while strengthening their potential outcomes through approved implementation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AACTE Bicentenntial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching. Educating a profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1976.

Andrews, L. O. From campus schools to teacher centers. Action in Teacher Education, 1980, 2, 9-17.

Applegate, J. and Lasley, T. What cooperating teachers expect from preservice field experience students. Teacher Education, 1983a.

Applegate, J. and Lasley, T. What undergraduate students expect from preservice field experiences. A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association in Montreal, Canada, April, 1983b.

Applegate, J. and Lasley, T. Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience students. Journal of Teacher Education, 1982, 33 (2), 15-18.

Applegate, J. H. Perceived problems of secondary school students, unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1978.

Boyer, E. L. High school. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Cruickshank, D. R. Teacher problems: A more meaningful focus for inservice education, unpublished manuscript, The Ohio State University, 1975.

Denton, J. Early field experience influence on performance on subsequent coursework. Journal of Teacher Education, March-April 1982, 33: 19-23.

Devaney, K. What's a teacher center for? Educational Leadership, 1976, 33, 413-416.

Dewey, J. Experience and education. New York: Macmillan, 1938.

Dewey, J. How we think. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1933.

Edelfelt, R. A. The reform of education and teacher education. A complex task. Journal of Teacher Education, 1972, 23, 117-125.

Elam, S. Performance based teacher education: What is the state of the art? Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1971.

Erdman, J. Assessing the purposes of early field experience programs. Journal of Teacher Education, July-August 1983, 34: 27-31.

Goodlad, J. I. A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersman, W. and Jurs, S. G. Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences, Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1979.

Houston, W. R. Competency based education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Exploring competency based education, Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1974.

Hoy, W. K., & Rees, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 28(1), 23-26.

Hoy, W. K. (1968). Pupil control ideology and organizational socialization: The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 76, 312-323.

Jacobs, E. (1968). Attitude change in teacher education: An inquiry into the role of attitudes in changing teacher behavior. Journal of Teacher Education, 19, 410-416.

Johnson, D., Cox, C., and Wood, G. Communication patterns and topics of single and paired student teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 1982, Spring-Summer, iv (1), 56-60.

Lasley, T. J. and Applegate, J. H. Problems of cooperating teachers for preservice field experience students, a study conducted by the division of teacher education and certification, State of Ohio, Department of Education, 1981.

McNaughton, R.; Johns, F.; Rogers, J. When less seems like more: Managing the expanded field experiences of the 1980's. Journal of Teacher Education, September-October 1982, 33; 10-13.

Martin, R. and Wood, G. The preparation of rural teachers: Confronting the needs of schools. The Small School Forum, 1984 (forthcoming).

Matthews, C. C. (1967). The classroom verbal behavior of selected secondary school science student teachers and their cooperating classroom teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1967) Dissertation Abstracts International, 67, 1394A.

Monis, J., and Curtis, K. Legal issues relating to field-based experiences in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, March-April 1983, 34: 2-6.

Roberts, R. A., & Blankenship, J. W. (1970). The relationship between the change in pupil control ideology of student teachers and the student teacher's perception of the cooperating teachers' pupil control ideology. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 7, 315-320.

Weinstock, H. R., & Peccolo, C. M. (1970). Do students' ideas and attitudes survive practice teaching? Elementary School Journal, 70, 210-218.

Wood, G., Bates, G., and Birkley, M. The effects of early field experience students on middle school students' achievement and behavior and teachers' performance. Ohio Middle School Journal, 1984 (in press).

Zeichner, K. Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1983, 34: 3-9.

Zeichner, K. and Teitelbaum, K. Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education. Journal of Education for Teaching, 1982, 8: 95-117.

Zeichner, K. Reflective teaching and field-based experience in teacher education. Interchange, 12: 4, Winter 1981: 1-22.

Zeichner, K. Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31: 45-55.

Table 1

Comparison of State of Ohio and Ohio University Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of Problems: Rankings

Problem Statements	State of Ohio Cooperating Tchr (n=172) Rank	O.U. - Secondary School Cooperating Tchr (n=34) Rank
I do not know what the college or university wants as the goals and objectives of my FES's field experiences.	1	4
My FES is often absent and/or frequently tardy.	2	13
My FES cannot operate audio-visual equipment.	3	2
My FES never asks any questions.	4	11
My FES has difficulty conducting lessons.	5	8
My FES cannot give clear and precise directions.	6	9
I never have enough time to sit down and work with my FES.	7	1
My FES is unable to deal with classroom activities or situations which are unexpected.	8	7
The college/university seems to have no idea what the FES has done or ought to do.	9	10
My FES appears to have no interest in getting to know other teachers in the building.	10	3
My FES rarely prepares before he/she comes to my classroom to teach.	11	6
My FES does not behave in a professional manner when interacting with students.	12	12
The college/university provided no assistance for me in working with my FES.	13	5

Table 2
Comparison of State of Ohio and Ohio University Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of Problems-Tests of Significance

Problem	State of Ohio (n=172) Mean	S.D.	Ohio University (n=34) Mean	S.D.	Rank	t
I do not know what the college or university wants as goals and objectives of my FES's field experiences	3.157	1.322	2.0882	0.900	4	9.377*
My FES is often absent and/or frequently tardy	3.151	1.200	1.324	0.806	13	17.075*
My FES cannot operate audio-visual equipment	2.715	0.882	2.588	0.743	2	1.351
My FES never asks any questions	2.593	1.053	1.588	0.743	11	10.050*
My FES has difficulty conducting lessons	2.546	1.253	1.882	0.913	8	5.929*
My FES cannot give clear and precise directions	2.535	0.914	1.882	0.844	9	6.663*
I never have enough time to sit down and work with my FES	2.465	0.994	2.647	1.390	1	-1.556
My FES is unable to deal with classroom activities or situations which are unexpected	2.419	0.930	1.912	0.830	7	5.173*
The college/university seems to have no idea what the FES has done or ought to do	2.389	0.982	1.853	0.744	10	5.526*
My FES appears to have no interest in getting to know other teachers in the building	2.337	1.061	2.147	1.048	3	1.743
My FES rarely prepares before he/she comes to my classroom to teach	2.337	1.166	1.971	0.797	6	3.588*
My FES does not behave in a professional manner when interacting with students	2.308	0.840	1.441	0.561	12	10.081*
The college/university provided no assistance for me in working with my FES	2.302	1.082	2.029	0.937	5	2.551*

*Significant at less than the 0.05 level

Table 3

Significance of Cooperating Teacher Perceptions
of Early Field Experience Problems
(n=34)

Problem Statement	CT Response (Means)	t
I do not know what the college or university wants as the goals and objectives of my FES's field experiences.	2.088	-5.992*
My FES is often absent and/or frequently tardy.	1.323	-12.149*
My FES cannot operate audio-visual equipment.	2.588	-3.244*
My FES never asks any questions.	1.588	-11.118*
My FES has difficulty conducting lessons.	1.882	-7.121*
My FES cannot give clear and precise directions.	1.882	-7.710*
I never have enough time to sit down and work with my FES.	2.647	-0.353
My FES is unable to deal with classroom activities or situations which are unexpected.	1.912	-7.662*
The college/university seems to have no idea what the FES has done or ought to do.	1.853	-8.961*
My FES appears to have no interest in getting to know other teachers in the building	2.147	-4.739*
My FES rearely prepares before he/she comes to my classroom to teach.	1.971	-7.511*
My FES does not behave in a professional manner when interacting with students.	1.441	-16.240*
The college/university provided no assistance for me in working with my FES.	2.029	-6.031*

*Significant at less than the 0.05 level

Table 4

CT Perceptions of FES Usefulness in the Field
(n=148)
(All percentages given in Adjusted Frequency)

Rating / Item	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Undecided	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	Mean	Median	S.D.
My FES provided positive assistance with my classroom paper work.	2.1%	.7%	5.7%	34.8%	56.7%	4.433	4.619	0.813
My FES provided effective one-on-one tutoring for those students who needed it.	1.5%	2.9%	6.6%	38.2%	50.7%	4.338	4.514	.845
My FES helped motivate some of my students.	.7%	2.9%	16.5%	43.9%	36.0%	4.115	4.180	0.835
My FES made it possible for me to do more with small groups.	4.2%	4.2%	8.5%	42.3%	40.8%	4.113	4.283	1.018
My FES made it possible for me to individualize.	4.7%	4.7%	12.4%	45.7%	32.6%	3.969	4.119	1.030
My FES made it possible for me to frequently spend more time with children who have special needs.	3.6%	5.1%	11.7%	43.8%	35.8%	4.029	4.175	1.007
My FES was more bother than he/she was worth.	71.4%	23.8%	3.4%	1.4%	0%	1.347	1.2	.615
My FES, in general, was a positive influence on my classroom.	0%	1.4%	6.3%	43.1%	49.3%	4.403	4.484	0.672
My FES, in general, was a positive influence on my performance as a classroom teacher.	0%	2.8%	10.6%	50.0%	36.6%	4.204	4.232	0.739

Table 5

Field Experience Students Expectations

Expectation	State of Ohio (n=291) Mean	Rank	Factor	Ohio University (n=65) Prefield Mean	Rank	Postfield Mean	Rank	t
I want to gain ideas to make my lessons more interesting	4.71	1	6	4.83	1	4.23	3	6.59*
I want to prepare myself for student teaching	4.63	2	2	4.57	5	4.05	6	3.80*
I want to gain confidence in myself as a teacher	4.61	3	2	4.48	6	4.43	2	0.33
I want to find out how to keep students interested in learning	4.60	4	1	4.60	4	3.93	8	4.42*
I want to begin to develop my own teaching style	4.56	5	4	4.45	8	4.06	5	2.82*
I want to know what is expected of me in the teaching profession	4.54	6	4	4.64	2	4.14	4	5.02*
I want to get experience in front of a group of students	4.54	7	2	4.46	7	4.46	1	0.00
I want to learn how to keep the attention of the whole class	4.54	8	1	4.63	3	4.08	7	4.41*

*significant at less than the 0.05 level

Table 6

Pre to Post Field Experience FES Expectancy Changes

(n=65)

Factor Expectations	Pre-Post Sig. Diff. Variables	Variables For Factor	% Significant Change
1. Assessing the complexities of teaching.	5	9	56
2. Modeling professional practices.	6	15	40
3. Acquiring professional insights and ideas.	4	10	40
4. Practicing teaching skills.	3	9	33
5. Understanding various school and classroom settings.	5	6	83
6. Dealing directly with students.	3	4	75
No Factor	3	-	--

Table 7

Comparison of CT and FES Perceived Problems

Problem Statements	CT (n=34) Rank	Mean	FES (n=145) Rank	Mean	t
I do not know what the college or university wants as the goals and objectives of my FES's field experiences.	4	2.088	4	1.986	0.58
My FES is often absent and/or frequently tardy.	13	1.324	13	1.331	-0.05
My FES cannot operate audio-visual equipment.	2	2.588	3	2.214	2.42*
My FES never asks any questions.	11	1.588	12	1.386	1.46
My FES has difficulty conducting lessons.	8	1.882	10	1.572	1.85
My FES cannot give clear and precise directions.	9	1.882	8	1.759	0.78
I never have enough time to sit down and work with my FES.	1	2.647	6	1.828	3.19*
My FES is unable to deal with classroom activities or situations which are unexpected.	7	1.912	9	1.690	1.46
The college/university seems to have no idea what the FES has done or ought to do.	10	1.853	2	2.221	-2.42*
My FES appears to have no interest in getting to know other teachers in the building.	3	2.147	5	1.890	1.34
My FES rarely prepares before he/she comes to my classroom to teach.	6	1.971	7	1.807	1.04
My FES does not behave in a professional manner when interacting with students.	12	1.441	11	1.552	-0.94
The college/university provided no assistance for me in working with my FES.	5	2.029	1	2.283	-1.43

*Significant at less than the 0.05 level

Table 8

Comparison of CT and FES
Factor Means and Ranks

Factor	CT (n=34) Means	Ranks	FES (n=145) Means	Ranks	F
Preparation for the field experience.	3.346	6	3.719	6	0.367
Understanding the partnership of teaching.	4.616	1	4.567	1	0.317
Professionalism.	4.515	3	4.550	2	0.118
Attitudes and skills.	4.550	2	4.492	3	0.187
Enthusiasm for teaching.	4.363	4	4.228	4	0.425
Planning and organization	4.017	5	3.759	5	3.707

Table 9

Comparison of FES Self-Assessment and Perceived Values of Preparation

(n=145)

Factors	Self-Assessment Means	Value Means	F
Preparation for field experience.	3.719	4.515	6.551*
Understanding the partnership of teaching.	4.567	4.659	1.069
Professionalism.	4.550	4.671	3.809*
Attitudes and skills.	4.492	4.662	1.518
Enthusiasm for teaching.	4.228	4.522	2.446
Planning and organization	3.759	4.356	44.367*

*Significant at less than the 0.50 level